



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/322,108	05/28/1999	YUTAKA IKEDA	49128(551)	7517

7590 08/22/2002

DIKE BRONSTEIN ROBERTS AND CUSHMAN, LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP  
P.O. BOX 9169  
EDWARD & ANGELL  
BOSTON, MA 02209

EXAMINER

BELLO, AGUSTIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2633

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/322,108

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Agustin Bello

Art Unit

2633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 2633

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,481) in view of Batey (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,512).

Regarding Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 17-19, and 21 Palmer teaches a digital optical communication device comprising: an optical reception circuit converting an optical signal received from any external source to an electric signal (reference numeral 104B in Figure 1); a decoding circuit decoding the electric signal resultant from conversion by said optical reception circuit (reference numeral 306 in Figure 4); a reception light intensity level judgment circuit judging an intensity level of received light based on the electric signal resultant from conversion by said optical reception circuit (reference numeral 308, 310 in Figure 4); a coding circuit coding transmission data (reference numeral 318 in Figure 4); and an optical transmission circuit determining a light emission intensity based on result of the judgment by said reception light intensity level judgment circuit and converting the transmission data coded by said coding circuit to an optical signal with the light emission intensity (reference numerals 310, 320, 324, and 322 in Figure 4 and column 5 lines 44-67). Palmer differs from the claimed invention in that Palmer fails to specifically teach that the decoding circuit judges whether or not the decoding is

Art Unit: 2633

normally completed and as a result of the judgment by said decoding circuit the optical transmission circuit light intensity adjusted. However, Palmer does teaches a form of acknowledgment between the transceivers of the system (i.e. if a loss of signal strength data at the receiver is detected then data transmission is suspended column 1 lines 52-55). One skilled in the art would clearly have recognized that acknowledgment of data reception and correct decoding would have been beneficial in order to avoid loss of data and to determine when it was necessary to re-transmit of data. Such acknowledgment between transceivers is well known in the art. Batey, in the same field of endeavor, teaches that it well known in the art to use a decoding circuit that judges whether or not the decoding is normally completed and as a result of the judgment by said decoding circuit the adjusting the optical transmission circuit light intensity (column 2 lines 58-65, column 3 lines 25-27, column 4 lines 38-47, column 5 lines 21-32, column 6 lines 8-11, column 8 lines 45-48, 58-63, and column 10 lines 11-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a decoding circuit that judges whether or not the decoding is normally completed as taught by Batey, and as a result of the judgment by said decoding circuit adjusting the optical transmission circuit light intensity in order to avoid loss of data and to determine when it was necessary to re-transmit of data.

Regarding Claim 2, Palmer teaches the comparison of the received light signal intensity with a threshold level (i.e. reference voltage) in the system (column 1 lines 49-55, column 3 lines 30-54column 4 lines 34-36), but differs from the claimed invention in that Palmer fails to specifically teach a comparison with a plurality of reference voltages. However, since Palmer teaches that a threshold level is used to compare the received light signal intensity, it would have

Art Unit: 2633

been well within the scope of the invention of Palmer to have used a plurality of thresholds or voltages in making the comparison. Furthermore, Palmer teaches that an optional second threshold could be used in the comparison of received signal intensity (column 4 lines 36-42).

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of references and Batey in particular teach that said optical transmission circuit determines the light emission intensity by referring to the intensity level judged by said reception light intensity level judgment circuit if said decoding circuit judges that the decoding is normally completed (as discussed above regarding claim 1), and said optical transmission circuit determines the light emission intensity without referring to the intensity level judged by said reception light intensity level judgment circuit if said decoding circuit judges that the decoding is not normally completed (column 8 lines 66-67, column 9 lines 1-6).

Regarding Claim 9, the combination of references teach that said coding circuit (reference numeral 318 in Figure 4 of Palmer) encodes said transmission data, said reception light intensity information (reference numeral 106A in Figure 1 of Palmer), and reception normal completion information judged by said decoding circuit (i.e. Acknowledge return signal taught by Batey as discussed regarding claim 1), and said optical transmission circuit (reference numeral 322 in Figure 4 of Palmer) converts the transmission data, the reception light intensity information, and the reception normal completion information coded by said coding circuit to the optical signal.

Regarding Claims 11, 15, and 20, Palmer differs from the claimed invention in that Palmer fails to specifically teach extracting a light emission intensity requested from a secondary station and a secondary station request light emission intensity control signal generation circuit

Art Unit: 2633

generating light emission intensity information requested to the secondary station. However, Batey, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a “handshaking” protocol in which a primary and a secondary transceiver exchange light emission intensity requests, and in doing so produce control signals at either or both of the transceivers that sets the intensity of the transmitted signal according to the request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the “handshaking” protocol taught by Batey in the system of Palmer in order to quickly set an optimum transmit intensity, thereby conserving power by eliminating the repeated exchange of intensity measurements before data transmission can begin (see columns 8 and 9 of Batey).

Regarding Claim 12, the combination of references and Batey in particular teaches that the said reception light intensity level judgment circuit judges the reception light intensity level based on the electric signal resultant from conversion by said optical reception circuit from the time at which said decoding circuit detects a start flag (inherently produced by the decoder waiting for reception of the frame in Batey Figure 13 and column 10) to the time at which said decoding circuit detects a stop flag (column 10 lines 21-56).

3. Claims 4, 7, 10, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Batey, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Minter (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,494).

Regarding Claims 4, 7, 10, 14, and 16, the combination of Palmer and Batey differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to specifically teach that the system comprises an optical fiber connected to said optical transmission circuit; and an optical fiber connected to said optical reception circuit. However, one skilled in the art would clearly have recognized that in order to

Art Unit: 2633

avoid external interference from sources such as the sun or fluorescent lights while enhancing the propagation distance of the optical signals one would have used fiber optic cables to transmit the signals between the transmitter and receiver of the system. Minter, in the same field of endeavor, teaches that the use of fiber optic cables is very well known in the art and in some cases is the preferred method of signal transmission (column 1 lines 57-67 and column 2 lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used optic cables as taught by Minter in order to avoid external interference from sources such as the sun or fluorescent lights while enhancing the propagation distance of the optical signals.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 5/22/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the combination of Palmer and Batey fails to specifically teach a digital optical communication device with a decoding circuit that decodes an electrical signal resulting from conversion by an optical reception circuit and judges whether or not the decoding is normally completed. However, it is clear that both Palmer and Batey teach a digital optical communication device with a decoding circuit that decodes an electrical signal resulting from conversion by an optical reception circuit. Furthermore, Batey in particular teaches that this decoding circuit judges whether or not the decoding is normally completed in that a BER signal is sent along with the information, thereby giving an indication as to whether or not decoding has been normally completed. One skilled in the art would clearly have recognized that a BER is an indication of the percentage of received bits in error compared to the total number of bits received, and further, an indication of the percentage of bits decoded normally

Art Unit: 2633

(e.g. non-erroneous bits) compared to the total number of bits received. The BER transmitted in the system of Batey would have given the receiver an indication as to whether or not decoding was being completed normally. If it was found that the decoding was not proceeding normally (as provided by the BER), the combination of Palmer and Batey teach that an adjustment to the power provided to the transmitter could be changed to correct this deficiency, thereby ensuring that decoding is normally completed.

Regarding applicant's argument concerning claim 2, as stated in the office action, it is clear that Palmer teaches the comparison to a plurality of reference voltages (e.g. thresholds) in that Palmer also includes a first comparison to a first threshold in step 204 of Figure 3 and a second comparison to a second threshold in optional step 206 in Figure 3. Applicant's argument's regarding transmission distances and reception of light intensity information is irrelevant. As discussed in the office action the combination of Palmer and Batey teach that a threshold is used as a comparison for the intensity of the received light, the comparison being used to adjust the intensity of the light emitted.

In regard to applicant's argument that limitations of claim 3 have not been met, it is clear and obvious that if no ACK has been received then decoding has not been completed normally, in response to which the transmitter is directed to increase the intensity of the transmitted power.

In regard to applicant's arguments that light emission intensity requests are not exchanged, Batey specifically teaches that "parameter negotiation" takes place between two transceiver. The "parameter negotiation" would clearly have included intensity request. Furthermore, Batey specifically teaches that once a primary transceiver has determined its transmit power level, it could approximate the distance to a secondary transceiver. This



Art Unit: 2633

determined distance is then transmitted to a secondary receiver thereby allowing the secondary receiver to extrapolate a starting power level. This enhancement by Batey clearly shows that intensity request based on distance can be exchanged.

Regarding applicant's arguments concerning claim 12, as stated in the office action Batey inherently teaches the detection of a start flag in that the device of Batey waits for reception of frame prior to comparison of light intensity information to thresholds. It is well known in the art that frames include headers which provide start and stop flags in order to provide a level of control. Furthermore, the system of Batey works according to a power saving scheme, thereby requiring an indication of when to begin reception of light intensity information and end reception of light intensity information

5. In response to applicant's argument that Minter teaches a fiber optic transceiver, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

6. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the present invention successfully communicates all the time, or that the intensity of the emitted light identification adjusted according to communication distance) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

Art Unit: 2633

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claim 13 is allowed.

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kunito, Takamatsu, Gilliland, and Tomita for teaching transceiver system wherein power intensity levels are controlled via feedback.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Agustin Bello whose telephone number is (703)308-1393. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 2633

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (703)305-4729. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

AB

August 13, 2002



JASON CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600